IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE, ANDHRA PRADESH
AT HYDERABAD

HON'BLE Mr. JUSTICE R. SUBHASH REDDY

Writ Petition No.18250 of 2006

Dated: January 19, 2007

Between:

K. Vanaja, D/o. Sayanna, aged 34 years, Occ: Student, R/o.2-7-1323, Vijayapaul Colony, Vaddepally, Warangal District.

… Petitioner

And

The Registrar, Kakatiya University, Warangal, Warangal District, and another.

… Respondents

Order:

Petitioner, who appeared for B.Ed. Examination in April, 2006, has filed this Writ Petition seeking Mandamus to declare the action of the respondents in not recounting/revaluating his answer scripts relating to Educational Technology and Computer Education as illegal and arbitrary and a consequential direction to the respondents to recount/revaluate his answer scripts in the aforesaid subject.

2. Petitioner has appeared for B.Ed. Examination in April, 2006. When results were announced, he was declared to have failed in two subjects, namely, Educational Technology and Computer Education and Methods of Teaching-1 Physical Science. Dissatisfied with the marks he secured in the aforesaid subjects, he applied for recounting/revaluation and paid the necessary fee. Pursuant thereto, respondents have revalued the petitioner's answer scripts in the aforesaid subjects, whereby a change was found in the marks awarded to him earlier in Methods of Teaching-1 Physical Science. However, there was no change in the marks awarded to the petitioner in Educational Technology and Computer Education.

3. Learned counsel for the petitioner submits that the petitioner has correctly answered all the questions in the said subjects, however, respondents have not properly valued/revalued the answers.

4. Respondents have filed counter affidavit stating that a change was found in the marks secured by the petitioner in Methods of Teaching and accordingly 49 marks were awarded to him instead of original marks of 16 and hence he was declared to have passed in the said subject. However, in the subject of Educational Technology and Computer Education, the difference between the original marks and the revalued marks was less than 10%; hence the original marks, i.e. 14 out of 100 was taken into consideration and confirmed.

5. The learned Standing Counsel has also produced the answer scripts of the petitioner, which would indicate that even after its revaluation; there is no change in the marks, which were previously awarded to the petitioner in the subject of Educational Technology and Computer Education. Except the petitioner's own assessment with

regard to the correctness of the answers given, there is no other basis. It is to be seen that expectation of students is not the criterion for awarding marks. It is for the examiners, who are experts in the field, to look into a particular answer and make their own assessment for awarding marks, having regard to the nature of question and the way in which the student answers it. Respondents have revalued the answer scripts of the petitioner as requested by him and, wherein it was found that there is no change in the marks which were previously awarded to him in the subject of Educational Technology and Computer Education. In that view of the matter, no direction as sought for can be issued.

6. The writ petition is devoid of merits and is accordingly dismissed without any order as to costs.

_____

JUSTICE R. SUBHASH REDDY.

January 19, 2007
MRR